

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,987	01/04/2002	Edmund W. Figiel	1994.CRG	8730
7590 06/24/2004			EXAMINER	
Cynthia L. For		TRAN, THAO T		
10 Finderne Av	FARCH AND CHEMITER	CAL COMPANY	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-0500			1711	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/039,987	FIGIEL ET AL.				
·	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thao T. Tran	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess			
THE REPLY FILED 07 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply n places the applicat	to a ion in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate originally set in the final (opriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	•		-			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S.			
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · ——					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	Fplace the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	enewly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• / /—		nd an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Final rejection still stands over the prior art of record. As pointed out in the prior office action of January 6, 2004, each of the references of Figiel, Eden, Lydzinski, and Nguyen teaches the composition as presently claimed.

James J. Seidleck Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700